



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

C. Lucilii Carminum Reliquiae. Recensuit enarravit FRIDERICUS MARX. Volumen Prius: Prolegomena Testimonia Fasti Luciliani Carminum Reliquiae Indices. Pp. CXXXVI + 169. Volumen Posterius: Commentarius. Pp. XXII + 437. Leipzig, Teubner, 1904, 1905. 22 Marks.

Untersuchungen zu Lucilius, VON CONRAD CICHORIUS. Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1908. Pp. IX + 364. 12 Marks.

Lucilius's *scribendi simplicitas*, the extent to which he influenced Horace, the tenacity of his reputation (Quint. 10, 1, 93-94), and above all the fact that he alone of Latin writers evolved a new literary form,¹ all alike fill one with eagerness to know more of this striking personality.

In Volume I of Marx's work we have a praefatio, a conspectus operis, prolegomena (IX-CXXXVI), the fragments of Lucilius (1-95), and indices, as follows: I. Nomina Propria (96-99); II. Index Auctorum (100); III. Index verborum Latinorum (101-155); IV. Vocabula Graeca praeter nomina propria (156-158); V. Versus Graeci (159); VI. Vocabula peregrina praeter Graeca (159); VII. Index grammaticus metricus rerum memorabilium (160-169). In Volume II, pages V-VII are devoted to praefatio, addenda and corrigenda; VII-XXII constitute a Supplementum Capitis <in volumine primo> de Nonio; 1-437 contain the commentary.

The fragments are well printed. Beneath them references are given to their provenience; the passages in which the fragments are set are printed in full in the commentary. The MS variants recorded are limited in number. One can thus easily see the materials out of which a text is to be constructed. Marx clearly indicates his own changes, additions, omissions, etc. This is of prime importance, because emendation, though a particularly crying need of fragments, is in fragments more than ordinarily precarious, since we know not the context (cf. e. g. Müller, Lucilius XLIII; Lindsay, Nonius I XXVIII-XXIX; Housman, Class. Quart. I 53-54).

¹Since Lucilius in Book 30 made the hexameter the sole meter of Roman satire, in each nation "the accepted satire is in verse, and that verse the heroic verse of the nationality" (so Professor Gildersleeve in the Universal Cyclopaedia and Atlas, s. v. Satire). Of all this Marx nowhere gives a hint.

I turn with special interest to the prolegomena. In IX–XVII Marx discusses the word *satura*. This form alone, he holds, is Latin; *satyra*, *satyricus*, *satyrice* are late; *satira* is not Latin at all. The discussion of the etymology of *satura* is brief and feeble. It reveals a serious weakness of Marx's book, the failure consistently to cite the literature of the subject under discussion; books and articles of prime importance are often not named.¹ Here he ignores Funck's article on the etymology of *satura* in Archiv V (1888) 33 ff. He agrees with Mommsen in regarding *satura* as *cantus saturorum vel ebriorum hominum*, connecting the word with *satur*, 'full'.² Walde, Etymol. Lat. Wört. (1905), does not notice this view. Marx will have none of *lanx satura*; Walde still regards this phrase as the starting point in any attempt to reach the origin of the word.

The existence of the dramatic *satura* Marx denies in toto. Neither Varro nor Verrius Flaccus in discussing the word *satura* mentioned a form of poetry called *satura*; hence, he infers, they had no knowledge of such poems. This point, which Marx seeks to prove by mere assertion, is not demonstrable so long as our

¹It is interesting to find the Germans, to whom preëminently is due the demand that before one writes on any subject he shall master the 'literature' even down to the most completely dryas dust details, repeatedly hoist with their own petard; cf. e. g., A. J. P. XXVII 74. On p. XIII Marx asserts that there was in Ennius *neque maledictio probrosa neque insolentia contumax*; he ignores Pease's argument (P. A. P. A. XXVII xlviii–li), that there was in Ennius a decided satirical element. Sellar, Roman Poets, 84, 114, had long before noted that the fragments of Ennius show marked satirical power. Again he declares (XIII–XIV) that we ought to say that Horace wrote four books of *saturae*; he does not refer to Hendrickson's paper, Are the Letters of Horace Satires? A. J. P. XVIII 313–324. One of the theses maintained by George Bancroft when he applied for his doctor's degree at Göttingen in 1820 was *Epistolae Horatii forma non re different ab eius Satyris*; see The Classical Weekly II 31. On p. X Marx disposes of Livy's famous account of the *satura* by saying that Livy wrote *magis rhetorice quam historice*, blandly ignoring all that Leo and Hendrickson, to name no others, have written on the subject. On p. XIII he calls Ennius *princeps auctor saturarum*, merely referring to Hor. S. 1, 10, 66, without discussion. This is to ignore wholly a warm controversy, and, in my opinion, to fly in the face of truth; to Horace *Lucilius* alone can have been *auctor saturarum*. Marx is unaware, apparently, that his 'argument' from the silence of Varro and Verrius Flaccus had been anticipated by Elmore P. A. P. A. XXX lxvii. In discussing the date of Lucilius's birth, Marx says not a word of Munro's argument for the year 168 B. C. (see Sellar, Roman Poets, 231; Journal of Philology VIII 16). But Cichorius (13) argues at length for this very view as if novel, also ignoring Munro's paper. For a still more striking omission see below (p. 480), in my discussion of Marx's views on Nonius Marcellus and Lucilius. Marx does indeed say (XVII) that he has not tried to put together all that has been said on satire, but in an edition plainly meant to be definitive and permanent, we have a right to expect a conspectus of the whole subject. A kindred weakness is the lack of cross-references within the work itself. This forces the reader to piece together widely-scattered passages; it leads also to divers inconsistencies, which I have not space to enumerate.

²Yet he thinks (XIII) that this derivation cannot be made to square with Ennius's *Saturae*.

knowledge of the writings of Varro and Verrius remains as imperfect as it now is. Further, argument from silence is always dangerous; cf. Cichorius 15. I may add that in discussing the etymology of a word one is under no obligation to mention all the uses to which the word was put in the course of ages. After a perfunctory discussion Marx tells us (XI) that he approves Vahlen's views of the *satura* as expressed by him in his Ennius² CCXIV. Vahlen disposes of this complex subject in two lines.

In tracing the applications of the word *satura* to forms of literature we must begin, Marx continues, with the phrase *per saturam*, which = *incondite*. Ennius, desiring to suggest that a certain collection of his poems had been made *incondite et e vestigio*, called the poems *poemata per saturam*. This assertion, I submit, is opposed to what we know of the pride Ennius took in his work; cf. Cicero, Brutus 71. There is a wide difference between calling certain pieces *saturae*, 'medleys', and calling them *poemata incondite facta*; medleys need not be *incondita*. Lucilius, continues Marx, called his writings *sermones per saturam*. Once more we have mere assertion. This is why, says Marx further, Horace at first called his pieces *Sermones*, not *Saturae*. But the term *Sermones* belongs to the days of Horace's Epistles, not to those of his so-called Satires; cf. e. g., Wickham, Satires and Epistles of Horace, editio maior, 6-9. Out of the titles *poemata per saturam* and *sermones per saturam*, says Marx finally, Horace at last made the term *satura*.

Such, then, is Marx's attitude toward a subject of profound importance to the right understanding of Latin literature. If there were Versus Fescennini and a dramatic *satura*, we can see more readily than we can in any other way why the first efforts to create a literature at Rome and for Rome took the form of the drama (cf. e. g., Sellar, Roman Poets 156). If the Italians had independently developed such forms of the drama, then, however embryonic these forms were, the Italians had independently taken some steps along the road which their far more gifted Hellenic brethren—more gifted, yes, but brethren still—had pursued so far and so well, a view a priori credible and supported by Roman tradition. If, however, there were no Fescennines and no dramatic *satura*, he who would make out a case for the originality of Latin literature is indeed hard pressed and we are confronted by an important psychological problem: can the artistic sense be implanted in souls wholly dead to all suggestions of art (cf. Nettleship, Lectures and Essays I 46)? But of all this Marx remains unconscious. He is unconscious, too, that in disposing of the dramatic *satura* he is disposing of the dramatic Fescennines also; both rest on the same evidence. But Professor Hendrickson remained unconscious through his long paper on the dramatic *Satura* and the Old Comedy at Rome (A. J. P. XV 1-30) that his argument logically carried out compelled him

to reject the Fescennines also; it was not till four years later that he took this step (A. J. P. XIX 285-311).

To sum up, Marx missed here a great opportunity, that of writing a really incisive discussion of this whole subject. He seems unaware that many, at least in America, are unconvinced by Leo and Hendrickson. He has not even given us a bibliography of the subject.

Marx writes next *De Vita et poesi C. Lucilii* (XVII-L). It is here that Cichorius's book comes within our field of study. In his preface Cichorius declares that thanks to Marx's book "ist für das Studium und das Verständniss des Dichters und seiner Satiren eine völlig neue Grundlage geschaffen worden". Yet his book, so far as it comes within our view, deals rather with points in which he differs from Marx. His point of view is historical; if the chronology of Lucilius's life and writings can be firmly established important results will follow for the student of those times and for the investigator of Roman history and politics. In pages 1-62 he discusses the family of Lucilius, the dates of his birth and his death, his social position, his estates, his relations with Spain and with Athens, his friendship with Scipio, etc.; in 63-98 he treats the chronology of the satires. The rest of the book (99-355) consists of *Untersuchungen zu den einzelnen Büchern*. There are finally (1) a *Namensverzeichnis* (357-359); (2) *Verzeichnis der behandelten Stellen*, (a) aus Lucilius, (b) Sonstige Stellen, (c) Münzen, (d) Inschriften, (e) Papyrus (360-363); (3) *Wörterverzeichnis* (364). There is no general index to the subject-matter. We shall be concerned with pages 1-98.

Of the many points that Marx considers in his treatment of the life of Lucilius (XVII-XXIX) few can be noted. Lucilius hated women and matrimony (XVIII); he remained a bachelor. He sings the praises of *meretrices et pueri*; in his old age he dedicated Book 16 to his *amica* Collyra. His birthplace, Suessa Aurunca, lay in territory once at least Oscan (XVIII). His excellent knowledge of Greek was not due to the fact that he was born and brought up near Campania, but to his education. He uses also Umbrian, Gallic, Tuscan, Sardinian and Syrian words. In verses 182, 1049 we see traces of the Latin that was used at Suessa Aurunca. He was extremely rich, especially in *praedia et agri*:¹ he was *rei rusticae gnarus et studiosus*, and *rei equestris peritus* (XX-XXI). We get from him some information about his slaves. Thanks to his *adfinitas*, through his brother's daughter, with the Pompeii, learned men of the Pompeian circle—Pompeius Laenas, Valerius Cato, etc.—edited his satires and helped to

¹ Marx (XX-XXI, XXIV) and Cichorius (22 ff.) both discuss Lucilius's wealth. Marx holds that he had an estate in Sicily; Cichorius maintains that he had *praedia* also at or near Tarentum and Consentia. Cicero, *De Orat.* 2, 284 shows that he belonged to the landholding class. In 254-256 Cichorius sees a reference to a journey to Sardinia. Why should Lucilius go to a place so notoriously unhealthy? Because, answers Cichorius, he had lands there.

give them their vogue (XX, L). As early as 159 he owned the house which had been built at Rome for the hostage-son of Antiochus the Great; this, however, Cichorius (10-11) disputes successfully. Sometimes Marx's imagination runs riot, as when he says (XXVI), "Non dubium est quin Lucilio inprimis rogante patrociniū sociorum <Scipio> suscepit" and declares that Naples gave him a public funeral "ob munificentiam hominis erga oppidum . . . et ob merita eius in socios Italicos". (On p. XXVIII he gives a different explanation of this funeral.) One would like support for views so concrete and so interesting and important if true.

In discussing the dates of the birth and death of Lucilius Marx notes that Jerome dwells at length on the death of Lucilius, but says next to nothing of the year of his birth; he infers, therefore, that Jerome had definite and correct information about the former only. On p. XXIII he adopts Haupt's view that Lucilius was born in 180 and that Jerome's error arose from a confusion of the names of the consuls of 180 and 148. To this Cichorius (8-9) demurs. By this view, he says, we have Lucilius in active service as an *equus* at Numantia in his forty-seventh year, an unusual phenomenon. If, however, we suppose that Lucilius went with Scipio to Spain *amicitiæ causa*, to aid him with money (Marx XXV), Cichorius's argument breaks down; even a *homo ætate admodum provecus* can fight thus.

But Cichorius has a more effective argument. Marx has rightly shown, he says, that Lucilius's literary activity (i. e. formal publication) began in 131. If, then, he was born in 180, he was for fifty years voiceless, then extraordinarily fertile; for fifty years he revealed nothing concerning himself, then made frankest revelation. But Horace, S. 2, 1, 30 ff. will teach us better; there we must emphasize *omnis vita*. Again, in the later books, which Marx assigns to 116-110, there is much erotic material out of keeping with an assumed age of 64-70 years. Far weaker is Cichorius's assumption that Lucilius and his brother (he has much to say in various places of the latter) were not far apart in years. The brother was active in the senate in 110; if he and Lucilius were born in 180 he was then 70 years old and still active in public life. For the view adopted by Cichorius himself, see p. 468, n. 1. If Lucilius was born in 168 all is clear, says Cichorius. By the Numantine War he was 33 or 34; he was 36 or more when he began formal publication of his satires. We understand his fanatical opposition to the marriage law of Metellus; we appreciate better his independence, if he was still relatively young. I may add that other Latin writers made their literary debut when they were in their thirties; e. g., Cicero, Vergil, Horace. Finally, if we adopt 168 as the date of Lucilius's birth, we are enabled to explain *senex* in Horace, S. 2, 1, 34 literally.

Marx, starting with the fact of Lucilius's birth at Suessa Aurunca, maintains that Lucilius was not a *civis Romanus*, but a

socius nominis Latini, an *eques municipalis* (XIX, XX, XXI). The *socii*, he argues, could gain citizenship either by leaving children in their home towns or by holding magistracies in those towns. Lucilius was a bachelor, he was not the man to value office in a provincial town. To this view Marx appends others. Since Scipio was *patronus sociorum*, we understand the friendship between him and Lucilius; a queer argument surely! In this view he finds also (XVI) the explanation of Lucilius's freedom of speech; the Italians, he asserts, held in those days that they were not bound by the laws of Rome. But Macrobius 3, 17, 6, the only authority cited by him, has to do with but a single law and that law a sumptuary regulation. Further, says Marx, for some time after Scipio's death, Lucilius published nothing, because the *socii* and the *Latini* were most uncomfortable at Rome now that their champion Scipio was dead. To all this Cichorius makes answer (14-22). The fact that Lucilius was born at a Latin colony proves nothing; in those days every Latin colony had its Roman citizens resident there, temporarily or permanently. Many families Italian, not Roman, in origin had gained citizenship but preferred to live on in their old homes. There is no hint in any of the many passages that refer to Lucilius that he was not a citizen; had he not been a citizen Horace could not have spoken of him as he does in S. 2, 1, 74-75. Lucilius's slighting reference to the Latin of non-Roman towns would have been most ungracious had he been merely a *Latinus* himself. In 592-596 Lucilius praises C. Persius, a pronounced enemy of the *Latini*. If Lucilius was in fact not at first a citizen, could he not have gained citizenship through some of his influential friends, aye, through his own brother and the Pompeii? Again, many of the fragments (e. g. 1259-1263, 1287, if the latter passage is rightly emended and interpreted by Marx) would have been impossible in the mouth of a *Latinus*, especially if we assume that the period was as unfavorable to the *Latini* as Marx would have us believe.

In 18 ff. Cichorius seeks to show positively that Lucilius was a citizen. In a *senatus consultum* of Adramyttium, the name of a man whom Cichorius (5) believes to have been Lucilius's brother is given as *Μάνιος Λευκέλιος Μαάρκου* (Eph. Epigr. IV 213, Viereck, Serm. Gr. 22). Now in the *Fasti Capitolini* Triumphales the names of father and grandfather are given except in six cases falling between 45 and 34 B. C., and one case in 19 B. C. We know enough of the seven men involved to be sure that their grandfathers were not citizens; hence the omission of the names of the grandfathers. We may infer that the mention of the name of father or grandfather proves the citizenship of the one named. Thus Lucilius's father and Lucilius himself as well were citizens. But Cichorius advances no real proof that the *Λευκέλιος* of the inscription was the brother of Lucilius.

Of Lucilius's service in Spain Marx speaks but briefly (XXIII, XXV); he nowhere hints that Lucilius had been in Spain prior to the Numantine War of 134-133. Cichorius (29-40) believes that his military experience was much more extensive, that he served at Numantia as an *equus Romanus* (not in the allied cavalry) and probably in Scipio's ἑλκ φιλων. By very ingenious combinations, which, however, leave me at the end somewhat cold, he seeks to show that Lucilius probably was in Spain from 139-136 in actual service. Lucilius's references to these wars are our oldest literary evidence for them; it would be worth while to prove that he wrote from personal participation and observation. Neither Marx nor Cichorius notes that Müller (Lucilius, p. 290, *Leben und Werke des Lucilius*, 5) long ago suggested that Lucilius had seen service in Spain prior to his presence there with Scipio.

Of Lucilius's knowledge of Greek Marx writes warmly (XVIII, XXVIII). He notes, too, that Lucilius was well known in Greece, instancing as proof the dedication to him of a book by Clitomachus. Cichorius (40-53), by an argument strained to the last degree, tries to prove conclusively that Lucilius had been in Greece for a long time, and that in Greece he had met Clitomachus and his teacher Carneades. One admires the ingenuity with which Cichorius grasps at every straw, but one cannot help smiling (till he grows sad) at the complete surrender of the logical faculty to the desire to maintain a startling thesis. It would indeed, as Cichorius says, throw brightest light on Lucilius if we could show that his familiarity with Greek (which Cichorius illustrates afresh) was not a matter of the closet at Rome, but the result of personal observation. But this is precisely why one should not venture the thesis on such slender grounds as those on which Cichorius relies.

Of Marx's theory of the explanation of the friendship between Scipio and Lucilius I have already spoken (p. 472). Cichorius treats the matter more fully (53-58). He reminds us how very intimate they really were; cf. Lucilius 961-964, 1138-1142; Hor. S. 2, 1, 71 and the scholiast there. There was not time, argues Cichorius, for the development of this intimacy after the Numantine War, for Scipio died in 129. It could not have begun at Numantia; the distance between general and subordinate, especially in the strict discipline maintained there by Scipio, was too great. Scipio was at Carthage in 149-146, in the East in 140-138; Lucilius was in Spain in 139-136 (see above). We are obliged, therefore, to carry the friendship back to the poet's early years.

Now the intimacy would seem to have had its seat especially in the country; cf. again Hor. S. 2, 1, 71, with the scholiast. Lucilius's family had an estate at Suessa Aurunca. Scipio had estates at Lavernium, which probably lay only a few hours' ride from Suessa; it was a quiet out-of-the-way place. Caieta, too,

where Scipio also had an estate, was near Suessa. Scipio and Lucilius may thus, concludes Cichorius, have been neighbors and friends for many years.

Marx turns now (XXVI-L) to consider the chronology of the Satires. Cichorius treats the same subject on pages 63-98; he holds that it is Marx's great service that he first undertook to determine the chronological order of Lucilius's writings.

Marx holds, as had others before him, that Lucilius began to write or at least to publish after his return from Numantia; the tense of *militaverat* in Vell. 2, 9, 4 is here significant. The first certainly datable references in the fragments belong to 131. The lower terminus, says Marx (XXVI), relying on the statement in Pliny, N. H. 36, 185 *Romae scutulatum . . . primum factum est post tertium Bellum Punicum initum, frequentata vero pavimenta ante Cimbricum . . . indicio est Lucilianus ille versus* (= 85: Book 2), is 105. The singular here in (*bellum*) *Cimbricum*, says Marx, clearly shows that Pliny had in mind the crowning years of the conflict with the Cimbri, 105-101. But, objects Cichorius (64), Pliny twice has *Cimbrica bella*; had he meant what Marx supposes him to mean, he ought to have added *posterius* or *alterum*. The singular must refer to the whole war, as it does in Flor. I 38, Asconius, p. 60; it is conditioned by the general run of the sentence, for Pliny is contrasting as wholes two great wars. In his note on the verse of Lucilius involved in this discussion, Marx refers it (and so Book 2; so Cichorius) to 119; hence the argument which Marx seeks to build on it for 105 as the lower terminus of the Satires falls to the ground.

Before Marx editors and critics had maintained that there were two ancient *corpora carminum Lucilii*, the one containing Books 1-25 of our present numbering, the other 26-30; see e. g., Müller, *Leben und Werke*, 27. Marx maintains (XXIX) that there were tria corpora: (a) 1-21; (b) 22-25; (c) 26-30. His argument is as follows: Of Book 21 we have no fragments, because this book stood last in one corpus and was thus by its position peculiarly exposed to destruction. Witness the loss of the *Vidularia*, itself last play of a corpus of Plautus.¹ We have a relatively large number of fragments of 22, the beginning of a corpus, few of 23-25, the end of that corpus. The lacuna, then, that separates 1-21 from 22-25 and the larger lacuna that parts 22-25 from 26-30 make for the doctrine of tria corpora (XXX). Again, 1-21 are in hexameters only, 22-25 in elegiacs, 26-30 in several meters, trochaic, iambic, hexameter. 1-21 differ, says Marx, from 26-30 in language and meter; we have *contrā*, old style, in 864 (Book 28), *contrā*, new style, in 1335, which probably belongs to 1-21.² Again, says Marx (cf. Cichorius 65), 22-25 are very different from *saturae indoles ac natura* (they are in elegiacs, not in hexameters,

¹ With this argument Lindsay, *Class. Rev.* XIX 272, has no patience.

² On Marx as a metrician see Housman, *Class. Quart.* I 61-62.

the vehicle of true satire); they contain no historical allusions, but deal with Lucilius's slaves. Marx maintains (XXIX) that Gellius used a corpus consisting of 1-21; Varro, too, he says, had this in mind in L. L. 5, 17. Lachmann, he adds, had rightly observed that Nonius used two corpora, one covering 1-25, the other 26-30.

Of the three corpora (c), containing 26-30, is the earliest. Müller had seen this (Lucilius IX, *Leben und Werke*, 31), but he had sought to prove it, says Marx, by dubious arguments. Yet Müller's arguments are in part those of Marx himself. In 589-596 (Book 26) Lucilius "de novae suae poeseos ratione . . . agit quasi ad scribendas saturas primum adgrediens" (cf. Müller, *Leben und Werke*, 27). I would call attention to Horace's *primus* in S. 2, 1, 63. Book 26 contains references to events in front of Numantia, which would have most point if made shortly after the events themselves, say on Lucilius's return to Rome, in 131. In 26-30 there are references to Scipio; these books, then, must antedate Scipio's death. In 131 Metellus Macedonicus, then censor, urged that all men should be compelled to marry. The woman-hater Lucilius (XVIII, XXXIII) assails this proposal (XXXIII); Marx thinks that Scipio, who was unhappily married, would have enjoyed a diatribe on women. This Metellus made Lupus princeps senatus in 131. There is, then, nothing in 26-30 that points to a time after Scipio's death. On the other hand since Metellus, when he heard of Scipio's death in *publicum se proripuit* and eulogized Scipio, it is hardly likely that Lucilius would have satirized him after this event. 26-39, then, fall in Scipio's lifetime, between 132 and 129.

These matters Cichorius discusses on pages 70 ff. On Marx's view that 26-30 belong prior to Scipio's death in 129, since he also dates Book 1 in 126 and Book 2 in 119, we have a period of ten years (129-119) in which the poet is virtually silent. Such a supposition is opposed to all we know of the poet's fertility. Marx seeks to account for this silence by asserting that in the years immediately following the death of Scipio it would have been dangerous for Lucilius, a non-citizen (but see p. 472), to write. But Marx himself is obliged to put Book 1 in 126; this book contains a sharp attack on Lupus, the most distinguished leader of the opposition. In a word we have political satire, of all kinds the most dangerous to its writer, if any kind at all is fraught with peril, under the very circumstances which Marx would have us believe so fatal.

Cichorius thinks he has most important evidence in Lucilius, 671-672:

publicanus vero ut Asiae fiam, ut scripturarius,
pro Lucilio, id ego nolo, et uno hoc non muto omnia.

The word *Asiae* here must denote the Roman province in Asia, and so the passage must fall after the date at which that province

was made, 129-126. *Publicani* in Asia existed first in 123 when the lex Sempronia first levied on Asia such taxes as the publicani gathered (I may refer to Greenidge, *A History of Rome*, I 218 ff.). Therefore the publication of the first corpus as a corpus cannot antedate 123, though some of the individual pieces in which there are references to Scipio made during his lifetime must go back of 129.

I return now to Marx. He holds that Books 1-21 are differentiated in time from 26-30 by the reference in verse 31 to the death of Carneades, which took place in 129 or 128. This line of argument can be applied, however, I would note, only to the completed collection, if, as Marx and Cichorius (66) both argue, separate pieces of the various collections were in circulation publicly or privately before the corpora were made.

The date of composition of the pieces in the remaining corpus, Books 22-25, Marx declares (L) that we cannot even guess, though elsewhere (XLIX) he holds that 20-21 are the latest utterances of the poet. Emphasizing again the difference in character between these books and the others Marx lets his imagination run in these words: "Suspiceris poetam Neapoli hoc modo manibus familiarium suorum litasse et grammaticum quendam diligenter has poeseos Lucilianae reliquias singulares quas in scriniis poetae defuncti invenerat collegisse disposuisse publici iuris fecisse, quo magis poetae humanitas nota fieret popularibus". But to assign these poems to the last years of Lucilius's life (Marx thinks [XXVIII] the poet withdrew to Naples in 105) is to date the collection: why then say that we cannot even guess its date? Further, why should we not suppose that a man who took the pains to propitiate the manes of his slaves took the pains also to publish the result that he might himself make his *humanitas* better known and show that he could write something more than satire in the narrow sense? This hypothesis is as legitimate as Marx's and no more undemonstrable.

Marx seems here to take for granted¹ what Müller (Lucilius XI) was at some pains to prove, (a) that each book contained several satires, (b) that the separate books were long. Every one remembers that Horace describes Lucilius as a fluent writer. The individual pieces, says Marx (XXXV), of the various corpora were published prior to the making of the corpora; verse 1013, for example, shows that earlier writings of the poet were then well known. Cf. Cichorius, 66-67.

Turning to the order of the pieces in 26-30, Marx maintains (XXXV) that it is chronological and that Horace saw them in the order in which we have them. His argument is that Horace, S. 2, 1, 63 ff., in mentioning the themes of Lucilius's satires names Metellus first, then Lupus; according to our fragments of Lu-

¹ He argues the matter, however, later; see CVII-CXI.

cilius Lupus was assailed in Book 28. But the considerations which lead a poet to arrange such things as names are too numerous and diverse to make this argument conclusive; given the idea Horace sought to convey so briefly, given the metrical values of the names Metellus and Lupus and the position of the two names seems well-nigh inevitable, aside from any effort on Horace's part to attain chronological accuracy where such accuracy could have had but the remotest academic interest to his readers or himself. One need only recall the order of the names in Horace, C. 1, 12, 33 ff., to see how indifferent he could be to matters of chronology (see Wickham on Horace, C. 1, 12, 34).

Marx maintains that we cannot tell whether Lucilius himself or another arranged this corpus. Müller had held that Lucilius made the grouping. This view Cichorius also holds (73-74). He thinks too that Lucilius wrote a prefatory satire to this corpus and that to this preface an array of extant verses belongs. On p. XXXVI Marx holds that Lucilius himself arranged Books 1-21; his chief argument is that we have a preface to Book 1 by Lucilius himself (Varro, L. L. 5, 17). Cichorius discusses this matter in 67-70. He reminds us that (1) the satires of a given book may stand in chronological order, as written for that specific book, (2) the book may consist, in whole or in part, of satires written long before and in part already published. Who arranged the books within the corpora? On what principle did he arrange them? On p. 68 he declares that "in Bezug hinauf die Verhältnisse für die beiden Sammlungen <i. e., 1-21, 26-30> der Satiren ganz verschieden liegen".

In Books 26-30, he says, we may see, with Marx, a chronological sequence. The meters of this corpus are of paramount importance. In 26-27 we have trochaic septenarii only, in 28-29 trochaic septenarii, iambic senarii and hexameters, in 30 hexameters only. Manifestly, says Cichorius, 26-30 were not arranged on metrical principles; verses in the same meter are not grouped together, the same meter appears in different books, and two or three meters appear in a single book. There was, then, some principle other than the metrical at the bottom of the arrangement; this was the chronological. But do the metrical and the chronological exhaust the list of possible arrangements? I can readily conceive of at least another—the haphazard. Further, the metrical phenomena to which he calls attention can best be explained on the theory that Lucilius began with trochaic septenarii, and that presently he experimented with other meters, till at last he tried hexameters, found them suitable and abandoned all else. On this view the arrangement of 26-30 as a whole is at once metrical and chronological. On pages 86 ff. he argues that the arrangement in 1-21 was not chronological. To get a starting-point here we must, he says, find some passage which we can definitely restrict to a period of a few months. "Die Möglichkeit hierzu verdanken wir der . . . glänzenden Kombinierung

und Erklärung der Verse 210-11 aus Buch V und 1130 durch Marx" . . . By this Kombinierung Marx gets the end of 117 or the beginning of 116, Cichorius 118 as the date of Book 5. By yet more Kombinierung we get 119 as date of Book 2. If, now, the arrangement of the books is chronological, we have four books (2-5) appearing within less than a year. On the other hand, if Books 1 and 2 are in chronological sequence, then on Marx's view of their dates we have seven years between them (126-119), on Cichorius's view of their dates four years (123-119). The arrangement, then, says Cichorius, was not chronological. Any one not actually engaged in the fascinating task of making such combinations readily sees how insecure a foundation they supply for the logical and dispassionate student.

I have not time or space to consider the views held by our authors of the dates of the individual books. Enough has been said, however, to indicate their method of attacking these difficult problems. As I read over what I have said above I am sorry that I have so often been obliged to speak in opposition to the views expressed in books which have both demanded much labor. I hope I am not insensible of the difficulty of the task they set before themselves or of the patience, research and ingenuity shown by both. Inasmuch, however, as both authors start with fragments, wholly or almost wholly contextless, then 'emend' their fragments in divers ways, at the risk of departing widely through such emendation from the sense actually conveyed by the fragments in their original setting, and finally proceed to put together these elements, so elusive individually, so baffling in themselves to the keenest thought, it was inevitable that any critic who subjected their work to careful analysis would find himself more often in opposition than in agreement.

I turn finally to consider Marx's theory of Nonius Marcellus's method of citing Lucilius. He regards Nonius as a much maligned man. Most people, he says, think of Nonius as *stuporis plenus et ineptiarum*, because they attribute to him "quae aperte erant mancipiorum opera collata et digesta."¹ After tracing briefly the attempts made to discover how Nonius composed his dictionary, Marx (LXXXIII) holds that Nonius followed the recipe given by Cato De Agri Cultura 76 for making *placenta*; "when you have it all done sprinkle with honey". So when Nonius had finished chapters 2-4 "tum tamquam mellis guttas versiculos Horatii superfudit operi perfecto". He had in his library the four books of Odes, the two of Sermones, in that order. "Ea volumina servulus ab initio ad finem perlustravit, notas criticas

¹ In the Prolegomena of Volume II, in which he seeks to show what Lucilius-citations Nonius drew from grammarians rather than from texts, Marx adheres to this view. We have now an easy method, far better than Horace's *quandoque bonus dormitat Homerus*, of defending ancient authors; we may charge, e. g., Varro's etymological *ineptiae* to some slave. On p. LXXXV Marx holds that other grammarians, too, may have used this backward-citation-method.

locis singulis apposuit. Quo facto sex illa volumina ita erant comparata, ut singula circum sinistrum umbilicum¹ quem dicimus convoluta non potuerint adhiberi, nisi denuo servulus omnia sex revolveret, quo facto in pristinum ordinem erant restituta. Quo labore commode supersedebat Nonii servus ita ut ultimum volumen primum replicando ab umbilico dextro exorsus sic deinceps singulos locos Horatii adpingeret capp. II-IV operis Noniani, ut ordine inverso hodie legantur: idem fecit in Lucilio quem a XXX ad XXVI librum regrediens ordine fere semper adhibuit; idem fecit nonnumquam in Lucilii libris I-XX Ciceronis epistulis et Academicis. Quae res non insani stupidi inepti erat hominis, sed parentis viribus et tempori et commode sicuti fecimus rei librariae condicione et ratione potest explicari". The argument in support of this position runs as follows. In Nonius 120, 134, 196, 203, 255, under the lemmata *hallec*, *ligurrire*, *clunes*, *diluvies*, *crepare*, we have references to Hor., S. 2, 4, 73; 1, 3, 81; 1, 2, 89; C. 4, 14, 28; 1, 18, 5. Hence "apparet inverso ordine eiusdem saturarum libri I afferri fragmenta". So in Nonius I-II four references to Cicero's *Academica* are given in reverse order (2, 70, 67, 57, 51). But elsewhere citations from the *Academica* follow the natural order. Again in Nonius IV four citations from Cic., ad Fam. 15 are given in inverse order (14, 5; 4, 2; 3, 2; 2, 2). Later in the same book we have two citations, in this order, 15, 16, 3; 15, 16, 1. On pages LXXXIV-CVII we have a table giving all the Lucilius citations in Nonius; from this it appears clearly enough that for some reason the citations given by Nonius from Lucilius 26-30 are so arranged that wherever a series occurs the citations from 30 precede those from 29, those from 29 precede those from 28, etc. Thus from Nonius 34-38 we have citations from Lucilius in this order: 7 from 30, 5 from 29, 2 from 28, 4 from 27, 7 from 26. For Books 1-22 there is little evidence of citation *inverso ordine*.

Now when we seek to value these phenomena we may at once eliminate the citations in Nonius II-IV. These books differ in certain respects from the remaining books of Nonius; see Lindsay, Nonius,² pp. 2, 5, n. h., 35-36. Until we can explain this difference and agree concerning its cause citations from these books will not avail to bolster up Marx's view. So far as the mode of citation from Books 26-30 is concerned, Marx has, with all his pains, adduced no new facts. Lindsay, Nonius, had set them forth clearly in 1901; indeed, Schmidt had done so in 1868. On p. 9, in enumerating the sources of Nonius's rough lists of words, under No. 25, Lindsay writes: "Lucilius Satires, Books XXVI-XXX. Curiously enough, the list compiled from these books began with Book XXX and ended with Book XXVI, pre-

¹ For the latest view of the *umbilicus* (*umbilici*), a view somewhat different from Marx's, see Birt, *Die Buchrolle in der Kunst* (Leipzig, 1907), 228-235.

² I cite thus, for convenience, Lindsay's Nonius Marcellus's Dictionary of Republican Latin (Oxford, 1901).

sumably because Nonius had begun his task of excerpting with the last book of the *Satires*". Here we come upon two curious phenomena. Marx, who knew Lindsay's monograph (see LXXXII), does not ask us to note that Lindsay had written the words just quoted from him. It is hard to believe Marx ignorant of the fact that Lindsay had done so; it is equally hard to charge him with lack of intellectual candor, in a failure to indicate that his view did not require so elaborate a demonstration after Lindsay's convincing presentation of the facts. On the other hand Lindsay, in his review¹ of Marx's first volume in *Class. Rev.* XIX 272, in laughing out of court the view of Marx now under consideration, utterly fails to recall or at least to cite the fact that he had himself set forth in print, at least in part, the very view at which he is so heartily laughing.²

I stop for the moment to consider Marx's explanation of this backward-citation-method (see his words cited above, p. 479). Does Marx *know* that immediately after the slave affixed the critical marks to Nonius's copy of Horace, Nonius himself or one of his slaves employed those volumes in work on the dictionary? The five references from Horace are scattered over 136 pages of Nonius's book. It must have taken some time to cover that ground: are we to suppose that all this time Nonius or his slave allowed these six *volumina* to remain in an abnormal condition? Further, is the scheme so ardently championed by Marx—for just a very few works, be it noted—in reality a time-saving plan? Only experiment could answer this, and even experimenters might disagree. To me, however, it would seem *a priori* clear that any plan of working through a book backward, involving as it does a wholly abnormal process, would inevitably involve a loss of time. Further, a man keen to save time would be far more likely to work as Lindsay (Nonius, 3) supposes that Nonius worked—by making at first from various sources lists of words, to which he could have recourse from time to time—than by making marks in the text; a multitude of different marks would be necessary and he would have been obliged to unroll the book scores of times as he worked along different lines. Marx's explanation, then, of the phenomenon he has noted fails to carry conviction.

That Books 26–30 of Lucilius were for some reason cited by Nonius in reverse order seems to be certain. Why? We do not know. Marx, however, assumes that Nonius or his slave worked backwards within the limits of the individual books. But this is by no means a necessary assumption. *A priori* such a procedure seems well-nigh incredible. It is a simple matter—for any

¹ This 'review' is unworthy of its author; its preparation cannot have required much time.

² It is to be noted that Lindsay in his *Nonius*, p. 9, has no conception that anyone would ever suppose that Nonius had made his excerpts from any given book backwards; his whole monograph is a protest against such a view.

reason—to examine Book 30 as a whole from front to back before 29, Book 29 as a whole, similarly, before 28, etc., but it is hard to believe that one would work through a long text to affix notae criticae of divers sorts and then seek later to pick up those marks by working backwards first through 30, then through 29, etc. (see above, p. 480). Further, such a supposition is opposed to all that we know of Nonius's procedure. It is platitudinous to say that the progress of knowledge is from the known to the unknown; some, nevertheless, seem to be unaware of this principle. Lindsay, Nonius, by comparing the citations from authors whose text is yet extant with that text, has demonstrated overwhelmingly that the citations are given exactly, in the vast majority of instances, in the order in which they appear in the full text of the author. I have space to cite but a single instance of this. In Non. 4-12 we have citations from Plautus in the following sequence: As. 172, 377, 706, 892, Au. 355, 422, Ba. frag., 792, Cis. 37?, Cas. 169, 267, 967, Cap. 661, Cu. 99, 613, Ep. 609, Men. 50, Am. 843, Mil. 632, 1407, Pers. 104, 169, 408, 421, Ps. 572, Poe. 48, Stich. 369, Poe. 312, Tr. 251, Tru. 566. In pages 10-35 and 37-88 Lindsay gives further proofs in abundance. The important exceptions, aside from Lucilius 26-30, are the few cited by Marx from Books 2-4 (on them see above, p. 479), but even in 2-4, as Lindsay shows, pp. 37-88, the evidence for the forward-moving method is overwhelming. Every consideration of logic, therefore, requires us to suppose that in such cases as Lucilius, where the text is lost, so that we cannot concretely test Nonius's method of working, that method was identical with the method he employed in such an overwhelming array of instances elsewhere. The leopard cannot change his spots, at least when they are as deeply ingrained as they are in this instance. Hence I feel that in applying his idea that Nonius worked backward even within the individual books 26-30 as a working principle by which to determine the place within the individual book of the fragments cited by Nonius, Marx erred seriously and thereby vitiated his arrangement.

At present, then, what we know is, that so far as the last five books of Lucilius are concerned, Nonius cited these in reverse order. In what order he cited *passages* from these books individually we do not positively *know*; but our knowledge of what he did in fact in so many instances elsewhere obliges us to start with the assumption that in citing within each book itself he worked forward, from the beginning to the end, not backwards, as Marx supposed. One thing is certain, that until some one disproves the facts presented by Lindsay concerning Nonius's mode of citing from a given book, we are obliged to agree with him (p. 3) that every edition of the fragments of early Latin thus far made has gone on wrong lines, because every edition has ignored these facts, though Schmidt had demonstrated them sufficiently as long ago as 1868, that is, before Ribbeck

brought out his *Römische Tragödie* (1875) or the two volumes of his *Scaenicae Romanorum Poesis Fragmenta* (editio maior: 1871, 1873), or Müller his *Ennius* (1884) and his *Nonius* (1888), or Vahlen the second edition of his *Ennius* (1903). One can easily see why the editors of the fragments have been loath to accept such a view as Schmidt advanced and Lindsay presented with greater detail; it ties their hands. Ignoring it, they are unfettered, free to let their imaginations roam at will; recognizing it, they have a far more difficult task to guess the coherence of the extant fragments.

Lengthy as this review is, I am obliged to omit all mention of divers matters of interest and importance. For example I have not discussed Marx's commentary at all. This I hope to do at another time.

CHARLES KNAPP.

BARNARD COLLEGE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

Les Cultes Païens dans l'Empire Romain: Première Partie, Les provinces latines. Tome 1, Les cultes officiels; les cultes Romains et Gréco-Romains. Par J. TOUTAIN. Paris: Leroux, 1907.

During the last two decades there has been a marked tendency in the study of religions to turn from the comparative method, which has attempted to construct theories of religious development without sufficient basis of fact and often without due regard to the varying conditions of time and place, to the historical study of particular systems or of individual cults. Indeed many more special investigations in the various fields must be made before a science of religion worthy of the name can be built up. Such a special investigation into the religious conditions of the Roman world has been undertaken by Toutain in a comprehensive work of which the first volume lies before us. The author has set himself to determine the manner in which the cults of Rome, both native and adopted, were spread among the nations which she conquered, to show how the national and local gods fared under Roman domination, and to make clear how far foreign divinities, transplanted from one part of the empire to another, took root and flourished. The contrast in character between Greece and the Orient on the one hand and the western provinces on the other has naturally led to a geographical division of the work, so that the Latin provinces only are treated in the present volume; of this about one half is devoted to those cults which Toutain chooses to call official, that is the worship of the Urbs Roma, of the emperor living or dead, and of the Capitoline triad; the remainder of the volume deals with the worship of the other Roman and Greco-Roman gods who belonged to the varied and